



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/551,546	04/18/00	NORIKAZU	T 087147/0437

FOLEY & LARDNER
WASHINGTON HARBOUR
3000 K STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5109

HM12/1023

EXAMINER
TRAVERS, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1617	7

DATE MAILED: 10/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/551,546

Applicant(s)

Tamura et al

Examiner

Russell Travers

Art Unit

1617



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 15, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 22-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 22-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/836,784.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit:

The restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 filed June 27, 2001 is withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 22-36 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,

Art Unit:

- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines compounds which are capable of "lowering postprandial hyperglycemia", "indane" derivatives capable of inhibiting angiotensin converting enzyme, or "pyridine" compounds "having the activity of inhibiting HMG-Co A reductase". Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of compounds which are capable of "lowering postprandial hyperglycemia", "indane" derivatives capable of inhibiting angiotensin converting enzyme, or "pyridine" compounds "having the activity of inhibiting HMG-Co A reductase" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all compounds which are capable of "lowering postprandial hyperglycemia", "indane" derivatives capable of inhibiting angiotensin converting enzyme, or "pyridine" compounds "having the activity of inhibiting HMG-Co A

Art Unit:

reductase", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claims 20, 22-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claims 20, 22-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 20, 22-31 and 33 are rendered indefinite by the terms and phrases attempting to identify compounds which are capable of "lowering postprandial hyperglycemia", "indane" derivatives capable of inhibiting angiotensin converting enzyme, or "pyridine" compounds "having the activity of inhibiting HMG-Co A reductase" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining medicaments that are capable of "lowering postprandial hyperglycemia", "indane" derivatives capable of inhibiting angiotensin converting enzyme, or "pyridine" compounds "having the activity of inhibiting HMG-Co A reductase" are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Applicant's term fails to clearly

Art Unit:

define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 20 and 22-36 are Inada et al, of record, in view of Applicants admission on the record.

Inada et al teach the specific angiotensin II antagonist compounds set forth in claims 27, 28 32, 34, 35 and 36 as old and well known for this therapeutic use.

Applicants admit on the record those specific indane compounds employed for reducing angiotensin II levels are old and well known for this use (see specification page 25, lines 12-34). Medicaments taught as useful for reducing angiotensin II levels are

Art Unit:


taught as useful, by Inada et al, for treating those conditions herein recited. Claims 20 and 22-36, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-angiotensin II agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. cf.. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.



Russell Travers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617